

UTORid:

Assessor:

(Initials)

Grade:

(0.5 increments)

/

20

Constraint Violations (no penalty for first; 0.5 for subsequent)

☐ **Must** be submitted as a single PDF document to Quercus (if video submissions are included for parts 2 and 3, these must be embedded as links in the document)

☐ **Must** include the student’s name and UTOR ID at the top of the document

☐ If videos are used, **must** upload them to UofT’s Mymedia service or another video sharing service accessible by the grader

☐ **Must** include a meaningful title

☐ **Must** include a word count for each written section (excluding titles, headings, and references)

☐ **Must** not include more than the maximum words of text or minutes of video for each section as allocated on the project handout. Any individual section >150 words or >1 minute greater than the maximum will result in a 0.5 pt penalty, even as first constraint violation.

☐ **Must** be presented in readable font no smaller than 11-point (if using presentations, slide font will need to be larger to enable viewing, 18 pt font minimum is typically recommended).

☐ **Must** name the file by the format as follows: <UTORID>—Research (eg Romkey99-Research)

☐ **Must** include at least seven (7) references (beyond course resources)

☐ **Must** use IEEE Reference System

	Unacceptable (<12)	Satisfactory (12-14.5)	Good (15-17)	Outstanding (17.5-20)
Quality of Topic	The choice of technology is unclear, overly simplistic, or overly speculative. The technology and its function(s) are poorly connected to a socio-technical network and specific human and/or “more than human” (environmental) actors, or impossible to make a logical recommendation about.	The selected technology is straightforward; the subject involves little area for novel investigation; it is logically connected to a socio-technical network and specific human and/or “more than human” (environmental) actors through an explanation of its function(s), and appropriate for making a recommendation.	The selected technology and its relevant function(s) have ethical implications worth discussing in relation to the socio-technical network and specific human and/or “more than human” (environmental) actors; the possibility of recommendation invites significant analysis of the topic.	As per Good+ the technology and its complete socio-technical network are clearly understood at a level of nuance and specificity that enables deep investigation.
Use of Actor Network Analysis (Graphic and verbal Explanation using ANT terminology)	The network is trivial or superficial; the network lacks connection between actors and an exploration of key relations; it generates minimal useful analysis about the impact of the technology. Minimal or no use of concepts from ANT.	An actor network represents the technology in a particular context, offering some insight on the technology’s impact; some important actors and relations are left unexplored; it offers minimal insight on key actors, including those vulnerable. Some use of ANT concepts to support analysis.	The actor network represents the technology in its particular context; it generates analysis about the technology’s impacts, including on those actors who are vulnerable and require voice, using specific concepts from ANT to support analysis.	As per Good+ allows for high quality exploration of relations of power and/or organization within the network; novel understanding of ANT demonstrated in some way.
Ethical Analysis	Ethical considerations are largely ignored or handled in a simplistic way that fails to reach a fair, well-informed ethical assessment.	Reflexive principlism and/or care ethics are applied to the technology in its context. Application is somewhat uneven, offering minimal insight on the technology’s operation related to actors impacted and/or minimal justification for the recommendation.	Reflexive principlism and/or care ethics are used effectively, with key principles applied appropriately, to assess how the technology operates within its context and in relation to particular actors; it builds effectively on the actor network and supports the recommendation.	A nuanced use of ethical reasoning generates novel insights about how the technology operates within its context and why the stated recommendation addresses concerns.
Recommendation	Recommendation does not logically follow the ANT and ethical analysis of the technology. No assessment of the recommendation is offered, or is missing obvious trade-offs or limitations, or it is so limited that it does not allow the reader to evaluate the quality of the recommendation.	The recommendation follows the ANT and ethical analysis of the technology and covers the key points, but may lack depth or may be missing key trade-offs or potential disadvantages. Evaluation may not be fully relevant to the recommendation as presented.	The recommendation is relevant and follows the logic of the ANT and ethical analysis, and the effectiveness of the recommendation is well assessed using specific metrics, trade-offs or limitations, and/or a general understanding of the context, key actors and ethics.	The recommendation offers a strong response to the ethical concerns. The report allows the reader to make an informed decision about this recommendation given the relevance of the evidence, and nuanced and fair assessment of trade-offs and limitations (including unintended consequences)

ESC203 RESEARCH PROJECT RUBRIC

Quality of Research	The research is inadequate, either because it is overly biased, lacking in rigour, or depending on simplistic sources such as internet posts or popular news items.	The research is largely credible and makes use of research articles or other credible sources. Where lower credibility sources are used, their value is explained. Evidence is integrated into the analysis but may not be well-used or may be selectively used to make a point.	The research incorporates a range of quality sources that are well used and explained to gain authority. It supports the logic of the analysis, including differing perspectives. The integration of evidence shows clear understanding of how it supports and clarifies the analysis.	<i>As per Good +</i> makes use of research that incorporates relevant disciplinary perspectives (e.g. ethics, philosophy, politics) and particular to the topic to enable depth of analysis. Nuances and limitations of evidence are shown and built into the reasoning.
Clarity of Structure	The project and its components lacks clear structure to help the audience understand the development of ideas. Paragraphs and visuals lack control over ideas or logical development. Claims may be unclear, and paragraph or visual transitions are non-existent or confusing. Poor integration between visuals and text/oral presentation.	The project holds to a basic logical structure, but may be missing useful indicators for the audience such as headings, titles, transitions or clear claims. Claims are reasonable, but may get lost in long, meandering paragraphs or unclear structure or order, or be unsupported by justification. Integration between visuals and verbal presentation is uneven.	The project demonstrates a visible and logical structure through such means as headings and titles, clear claims, good transitions between sections, paragraphs or visuals, and paragraphs that develop a single topic. Claims are nuanced and developed in well-organized paragraphs and/or visuals that build logically. Visuals and oral/written presentation are well-integrated.	<i>As per Good +</i> uses subtle transitions or logic developments to guide the audience into clear understanding within or between sections, or between visual and oral or written components.
Clarity of Communication	Sentences are sometimes so confusing that the audience cannot decipher meaning without multiple readings or viewings. Vocabulary errors are so extensive they prevent understanding. Network and/or visual design impedes understanding due to visual clutter or lack of organization.	Sentence structure is mostly clear, but errors or awkward organization may occasionally force the reader to re-read, review, or leave ideas incomplete. Vocabulary problems sometimes create confusion. Network and/or visual design is generally interpretable with some room for improved visual organization to enhance understanding.	Sentence structure and grammar are clear, enhancing audience understanding. Vocabulary is mostly clear. Occasional errors do not inhibit meaning. Good network and visual design that enables accurate audience interpretation.	<i>As per Good +</i> Sentence structure creates precise and nuanced understanding. Writing and/or oral presentation is concise showing advanced command and use of vocabulary. Well-structured network and visuals that enhance audience understanding in a novel way through strong visual organization and novel features.

Holistic Feedback